



## COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SOME DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES<sup>i</sup>

**Faik Ardahan<sup>ii</sup>**

Prof. Dr.,  
Akdeniz University,  
Sports Science Faculty,  
Recreation Department,  
Turkey

### **Abstract:**

The aim of this study is to determine how the quality of life of individuals changes according to demographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, personal income, family income, education, place of work, current employment status, with whom they live at home, the number of people living in the house, the number of rooms in the house where they live, the ownership status of the house, the presence of the room belonging to the individual in the living house, paying hire for home. The research is descriptive research, and all individuals with or without physical health constitute the main body of the research. Research data is collected by electronic questionnaires. In the study, the random sampling method and the Quality-of-Life Scale (QoLS) developed by Ardahan (2020) were used as data collection tools. The sample size consists of 689 individuals ( $X_{age} = 39.80 \pm 1.67$ ). In the evaluation of the data, besides descriptive statistics, Independent-Samples T Test, ANOVA test and LSD test were used to determine between which groups the difference was. The results were questioned at the significance level of 0.01 and 0.05. According to the research findings, QoLS is a multidimensional concept and the sub-dimensions of it; When Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Work/School Life, Feeling Safe, Social Pressure, Time Allocation, Neighborhood Relationship, Satisfaction with the Living Environment, Satisfaction with the Social Environment, Perceived Environmental Safety, Finding Sufficient Home, Being a Volunteer, Spiritual Life, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment and Well-Being were compared by gender, marital status, age, personal and family income, education, place of work, current employment status, who lives in the house, the number of people living in the house, the number of rooms in the house where the house is lived, the ownership status of the house where the house is lived, the presence of a room belonging to the individual in the living house, and the situation of renting the house in

<sup>i</sup> This study is the extended version of the paper presented orally in XII International Sports Community Symposium from 27 to 29th March 2020 in Antalya, Turkey.

<sup>ii</sup> Correspondence: email [ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr](mailto:ardahan@akdeniz.edu.tr)

which they live have effect on each sub dimension of QoLS and show different statistically significant differences in sub-dimensions.

**Keywords:** quality of life, demographics variable, recreation

## 1. Introduction

Quality of life (QoL) is basically based on the calculation of objective conditions and subjective evaluations of human life. It coincides with the scope of life satisfaction, life satisfaction, happiness, subjective and psychological well-being. In this sense, the history of the concept of QoL dates back to ancient times in the fields of sociology and medical sciences. According to the first philosopher, Aristotle and the philosophers who came after him, the main purpose of life is to have the highest level of happiness and the best situation (Lynda & Mandzuk, 2005). It is seen that individuals who reach their goals have the highest QoL level.

Quality of life is a multidimensional concept that encompasses all of the material and spiritual values that individuals have. From this perspective, it is a combination of the standard values obtained in all areas of life, with the individual's inner gaze and the view of finding his own life meaningful. The fact that these are at the highest level indicates the existence of quality of life (Şeker, 2010, 2015). According to Campel *et al.* (1976); "QoL is the sum of the interaction of perceptions of individuals towards themselves and the satisfaction achieved in areas such as marriage, working life and social relations, from meeting basic needs". World Health Organization has expressed the QoL as "perceiving the life of the individual in a value and culture system according to his/her own interests, standards, expectations and goals" (Demiray, 2019). Veenhoven (2000) defined QoL as "an expression of wealth in another concept". The important point here is that the basic standards in order to reach the goals related to the QoL are not imposed externally; the individual evaluates his / her life completely, and this evaluation is sustainable (Top *et al.*, 2003; Bilir *et al.*, 2005).

Generally, YK can be used in two ways; it is considered as a) objective (objective) and b) subjective (subjective) QoL. Objective QoL is about the degree to which the well-being meets concrete and observable criteria. While objective QoL includes elements such as income security for everyone, safety on the street, good health care, and education, subjective QoL is about how people perceive and appreciate their lives personally. For example, how safe their income is, how safe they feel on the street, how satisfied they are with their health and education, etc. Subjective evaluations usually contain judgments in terms of satisfaction (Veenhoven, 1996).

## 2. Factors Affecting the Quality of Life

Quality of life indicators can be considered under two dimensions, mostly subjective and objective indicators. Financial opportunities, physical well-being, self-care, physical well-being, family status, place of residence, accommodation conditions, and economic status

are among the objective indicators. Subjective indicators are more related to life satisfaction. In this respect, quality of life is a subjective result or satisfaction that an individual evaluates (Tüzün & Eker, 2003).

Factors affecting QoL are considered as factors that increase and decrease QoL. Accordingly, the factors that increase QoL; social relations, being an independent individual, making life meaningful, living in a safe environment, respect for personal beliefs and values, socioeconomic competence, respect for sacred values and beliefs. Factors that decrease QoL are; Failure to meet physiological needs, health problems, sexual perceptions and problems, lack of social support, various health problems, and negativity in familial and close relationships (Özgür *et al.*, 2008). According to the World Health Organization (WHO, 1997), factors affecting Qo; Psychological state, Environmental characteristics, Independence level, Physical state, Social relations, Spirituality / religion / belief. In addition, these;

- Liu (1976); air, water, climate, urban building, environmental pollution,
- Zenhner (1977); physical and mental health, family and marital life, work and satisfaction with the work being worked,
- Campbell *et al.* (1976); national government policies, friendship relations, financial situation, social relations,
- Boyer and Savageau (1981); housing, educational opportunities, environment and safe environment related to crime,
- Evans (1994); satisfaction, competences,
- Gregory *et al.* (2009); social belonging,
- OECD Better Life Index (2015), living conditions, productivity,
- The Quality-of-Life Model, Quality of Life Research Unit (2015) physical and intellectual sophistication,
- Ardahan (2020) dimensions of neighborhood, social pressure, volunteering, time allocation, having tools/equipment/ equipment and well-being accept all as factors affecting QoL by adding to previous studies.

From another point of view, Oktik (2004) discussed the factors affecting the QoL under five sub-headings. These are: a) health-related QoL, b) economic QoL, c) social QoL, d) ecological QoL, and e) psychological QoL.

- a) **Psychological Quality of Life.** Psychological indicators of QoL; these are subjective evaluations of the satisfaction achieved after meeting the essential needs of a person and the satisfaction he receives from his personal life, job, family and relations with his environment (Behlül, 2015). The satisfaction that a person receives from his social environment and his private life causes him to make positive judgments against himself and society. Thus, positive effects are reflected from individual to society, from society to individual (Demir, 2017).
- b) **Economic Quality of Life.** Economic indicators of the IU are the most important variable in meeting basic needs. Economic QoL is the most basic indicator that determines what people can do and what they can have on individual and social grounds. Therefore, the adequacy of economic income and the economic growth of the country affect people's living standards (Sapançalı, 2009). At the same time,

it positively affects subjective evaluations at the psychological level by providing economic security. However, some studies state that economic indicators are transformed into behavior under the influence of cultural values, although they care. The economic capacities of people do not always allow doing everything. The effect of people, who are social entities, on adapting to their traditional lives is observed (Demir, 2017). For example, it can be evaluated that people do not dress or behave the way they want, even if their economic power allows them in the family environment.

- c) **Health-Related Quality of Life.** Health-related indicators of QoL are handled both individually and socially. From an individual perspective, health is mainly about feeling well and looking at the state of health from a general perspective. It has three dimensions. Physical health; self-sufficiency of the person, psychological health; and social health are the level of perception of the relationship he establishes with the people around him. Socially, the quality of life is the good health conditions of the whole society and ensuring that all citizens have access to a qualified health service (Sapanca, 2009). Health is closely related to the lifestyle of the person and the environment in which he lives. Changes in a person's behavior and lifestyle throughout his life lay the groundwork for new dimensions to occur in his or her state of health. The individual's low body movement, the environment he lives in or not doing sports, the proliferation of pollution and urbanization, economic and social problems caused by intensive urban housing, and factors that cause psychological tension and cultural conflict play a decisive role in the health problems of the individual (Zorba, 2014). In this respect, health directly affects the quality of life.
- d) **Social Quality of Life.** Social indicators of QoL include a quantitative assessment that includes objective conditions of QoL at the social level. Social indicators include measures of social welfare in comparison with economic indicators. The purpose of these measurements is to be used statistically in determining social problems, making action plans and determining relevant policies. In the most comprehensive way, it is an approach used to follow the changes in the social structure. During the efforts to express the concept of social QoL, in the subjective dimension of QoL, how the individual feels in the social environment to which he belongs. In objective terms, it is stated that there is a need to consider issues such as quality leisure time activities, residence conditions, home, job guarantee, economic security and education (Oktik, 2004).
- e) **Ecological Quality of Life.** Ecological QoL is defined as the harmony of the environment and the individual and states that the said harmony is related to the mutual reactions of the environment and the individual. A three-dimensional draft has been developed regarding the ecological quality of life. These are units surrounding the individual; a) family, b) neighbor, c) city and city-like environmental elements. The protection and survival of the individual, the interaction of the environment, the individual and his needs reveal the three conceptual dimensions of ecological quality of life (Oktik, 2004).

f) **Family Quality of Life:** The concept of family QoL has been derived from the concept of QoL and has become a topic that has started to be at the forefront in the field of socio-political psychology, health and developmental disability (Bayat, 2005). "Quality of Family Life" can be expressed as the ability of the family to create the conditions in which it can meet its needs, the ability of family members to take care of the work that is important to them, and the pleasure of living together as a family (Park *et al.*, 2003). Family is mostly the first institution that meets the psychological and physical needs and the need for belonging of the person. The support given by the family to meet the needs of the individual affects the quality of life of the individual, both subjective and objectively, in social and familial dimensions. Spending pleasant and quality time with other members of the family, suggesting effective solutions to solve the family's problems, establishing supportive and close relationships among family members, offering the family members the chance to benefit from health and education opportunities, and living in a comfortable and safe environment, It plays a decisive role in the quality of life at the level of life.

In addition, addressing the work and school dimensions of quality of life is both important and necessary.

g) **Quality of Work Life:** The work life in which people work is also important in terms of the continuity of human life. Because life is a whole, it is impossible to consider work and QoL separately from each other (Yüksel, 2004). The job of an individual is the determinant of his/her position in society, the satisfaction and pleasure s/he receives from life, and all kinds of material and spiritual opportunities that s/he provides to his family (Çakmak, 2004). In other words, although business life is a necessity for individuals, it also has a duty that makes them free and social individuals. Considering the original form of the concept of quality of work life, it is stated that the quality of the relationship that exists between the worker and the work environment should be emphasized, and it is necessary to emphasize the neglected human dimension as well as the economic and technical dimension of the job (Yıldız, 2013). In order to create humanized working conditions, quality of work life explains the fulfillment of the social, psychological and mental needs of the working individual rather than the basic needs, and the redesign of the work environment according to the individual needs of the employees (Aba, 2009). Quality of work life is a systematic approach that creates fundamental values against work, such as democratic control, job enrichment, safe working conditions, and participation in decisions, making an impact in every aspect of the organization. Also referred to as "positive work environment" in the concept of work life quality; there is a definition of a working environment in which employees are satisfied with their jobs, colleagues and the way they are managed (Ayaz and Beydağ, 2014). With KAIZEN, which expresses the development of the individual in the business environment and his participation in the process, the change in the perception of the quality of the job also affects the quality of work life.

It is necessary to add the School Life Quality, which concerns the school life of the students who constitute a significant part of the society, to all these dimensions. School and educational environments where students can meet their current and future expectations are important because they will prepare the person more accurately for social, professional and business life. By designing student-centered education on a sectoral basis, preparing students for the future in the education process is necessary for a healthy society design.

Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu (2016) used the variables as indicators of QoL in their studies as Gender, Age, Marital Status, Education, Income, Health, Social Support, Housing and Characteristics, Work Life, Leisure Time Activities. According to Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu;

- According to the gender variable, QoL has been found against women, especially in underdeveloped and developing countries, due to their roles such as mother, wife, businesswoman, housework, and childcare (Sabbah *et al.*, 2003; Torlak & Yavuzçehre, 2008; AREM, 2007; Aslan, 2009).
- When the QoL is examined by age, it can be said that even though it differs in every age or age group, QoL decreases especially depending on aging (Öztop *et al.*, 2009; Memik *et al.*, 2007; Bilir *et al.*, 2005; Azman *et al.*, 2003; Sabbah *et al.*, 2003).
- When QoL is evaluated according to marital status, having a meaningful and satisfying marriage/relationship increases QoL. Divorce and widowhood can negatively affect the IO depending on how the individual and society perceive it (Perim, 2007; Avcı & Pala, 2004; Baydur, 2001; Akgül Sarpkaya, 2012; Özar & Yakut Çakar, 2012; Aydiner Boylu & Öztop, 2013).
- Education creates an advantageous situation in terms of personal development and employment, as well as the amount of wages and social opportunities (Torlak & Yavuzçehre, 2008).
- The concept of income refers to individual and family income. As it is the main factor that plays a role in the purchase of all kinds of needs, from health to education, from housing to market shopping, and equipment and equipment, it is accepted as a situation where the QoL will increase as it rises, as in education. However, it should be known that income alone may not be the determinant of QoL (Aydiner Boylu, 2007; Torlak & Yavuzçehre, 2008).
- In addition to these, physical, psychological and social health is one of the most important indicators of QoL. Being self-sufficient, being able to meet their own physical needs, having good psychological and social health, and being able to pay treatment expenses in case of any illness positively affect the SC (Yancar, 2005; Yapıcı, 2006; Koçoğlu and Akın, 2009).
- One of the important indicators of QoL is the quality of the individual's interactions with family, relatives, peers, friends from work/school/hobby groups, friends from the social world, and neighbors. The meaningful and fulfilling relationship created and maintained with the individuals in this group mentioned positively affects YK (Hollar, 2003; Özmete, 2010; Eriş, 2012).

- One of the other important indicators of the QoL is the location of the house where the house is lived, its size, whether the house and the neighborhood where the house is located are safe, the air conditioning infrastructure of the house, and the ownership of the house (Aydiner Boylu, 2007; Torlak & Yavuzçehre, 2008).
- The individual has a job; the job provides the individual's current and future job, profession, and social and wage satisfaction, and the positive factors experienced in the work environment positively affect the SC (Akgündüz, 2013; Gülmez, 2013).
- The existence of leisure time activities in which the individual participates actively and/or passively and transformed into a lifestyle positively affects QoL (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016).

In this study, the relationship between quality of life and various demographic variables in Turkish society is discussed and how it changes according to these variables. In this state, it is one of the most comprehensive studies, which is the first.

### 3. Method

The aim of this study is to determine how the quality of life of individuals changes according to demographic variables such as gender, marital status, age, personal income, family income, education, place of work, current employment status, with whom they live at home, the number of people living in the house, the number of rooms in the house where they live, the ownership status of the house, the presence of the room belonging to the individual in the living house, paying hire for home.

The research is descriptive research, and all individuals with or without physical health constitute the main body of the research. Research data is limited to individuals on social media as electronic questionnaires collect it. The random sampling method was used in the study, and the Quality-of-Life Scale (QLS) developed by Ardahan (2020) was used as the data collection tool. The population of Turkey over the age of 18 in 2020 is approximately 61 million (TUIK, 2020). The sample size was calculated as a minimum of 666, with an error margin of  $\pm 5$  within a 99% confidence interval. Accordingly, the sample size of the study consists of 689 individuals ( $X_{\text{year}} = 39.80 \pm 1.67$ ), and the sample size is sufficient.

In the evaluation of the data, besides descriptive statistics, the Independent-Samples T-Test, ANOVA test, and LSD test were used to determine the difference between the groups. The results were questioned at the significance level of 0.01 and 0.05.

### 4. Findings

The demographic results of the participants are given in Table 1. As can be seen from the table, there is a balance in the participation rates of male participants (51.8%) and female participants (48.2%). The rate of married participants (56.0%) is higher than the rate of single participants (44.0%), the average age of the participants is 39.80 years old, and most of them are between 26-54 years (74.4%), significant portions of the participants (75.9%)

live with their families, the majority of the participants (77.4%) live in their homes, with 2-4 people.

**Table 1: Demographic Results**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Marital Status</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
M- Man	357	51,8	M- Married	386	56,0
W- Woman	332	48,2	S- Single	303	44,0
<b>Range of Age</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Whom They Live With</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
a) 25 and younger years old	88	12,8	a) Alone	122	17,7
b) 26-34 years old	156	22,6	b) With my friends	44	6,4
c) 35-44 years old	201	29,2	c) With my family	523	75,9
d) 45-54 years old	156	22,6	<b>Number of People in Home</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
e) 55 and older years old	88	12,8	a) 1	113	16,4
Average Age of Participants	$X_{age}=39.80\pm 1.67$		b) 2-4	533	77,4
<b>Number of Rooms</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	c) 5 and more	43	6,2
a) 1+1	43	6,2	<b>Room Belonging to You?</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
b) 2+1 - 3+1	530	76,9	Y- Yes	564	81,9
c) 4+1 - 5+1	106	15,4	N- No	125	18,1
d) 6+1 and more	10	1,5	<b>Education Status</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Business Place</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	a) High school equivalent and below	95	13,8
a) Public Sector	229	33,2	b) Bachelor's degree	409	59,4
b) Private Sector	192	27,9	c) Postgraduate Degree	185	26,9
c) Self-employed/ own business	81	11,8	<b>Monthly Income*</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
d) Retired	71	10,3	a) 350 \$ and below	141	20,5
e) Student	70	10,2	b) 351 - 700\$	227	32,9
f) House-wife	24	3,5	c) 701 - 1.050\$	171	24,8
g) Unemployed	22	3,2	d) 1.051 - 1.400\$	66	9,6
<b>Ownership of Home</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	e) 1.401\$ more	84	12,2
a) My own/ my wife's/husband's	279	40,5	<b>Monthly Family Income*</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
b) My family's	121	17,6	a) 450\$ and below	93	13,5
c) I don't pay the hiring	12	1,7	b) 451 - 900\$	210	30,5
d) Hired house	266	38,6	c) 901 - 1.350\$	135	19,6
e) I stay in somewhere except home	11	1,6	d) 1.351- 1.800\$	107	15,5
<b>Currently Employed</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	e) 1.801 - 2.250\$	64	9,3
Y- Yes	502	72,9	f) 2.251\$ and more	80	11,6
N- No	187	27,1	<b>Pay Hire?</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>689</b>	<b>100,0</b>	Y- Yes	277	40,2
*(1\$=5,65TL)			N- No	412	59,8

This shows that there is a family life suitable for the elementary family structure. Most of the participants (76.9%) live in 2+1 and/or 3+1 houses, 40.5% of the participants live in their own houses, 38.6% in a rented house, and 17.6% in a family's house, significant portions of the participants (81.9%) have their own room in the house where they live, a significant portion of the participants (86.3%) had a university or higher education, 33.2%



of the participants are in the public sector, 27.9% in the private sector, 11.8% are self-employed, 10.3% are retired, 10.2% are students. 6.7% are housewives or unemployed, 53.4% of the participants have a personal income of 700\$ or less, while 63.6% of them have a total monthly family income of 1350\$ or less. In this way, it can be said that the participants are middle-income people.

The comparison of QoL factors according to the gender of the participants is given in Table 2. As can be seen from the table, although there is no statistically significant difference according to gender in the Total Quality of Life (TQoL), except for The Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Perceived Environmental Safety, and Well-Being factors, there is no statistically significant difference according to the gender variable. This significant difference in favor of men may be due to the fact that men have more employment opportunities and income than women, as given in Table 2a, Table 2b and Table 2c.

**Table 2:** Comparison on Factors of YK in Regard of The Gender

Factors	t	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	1,910	,056	-
Family Relationship	1,855	,064	-
Perceived Income Level	<b>1,993</b>	<b>,047</b>	<b>M+</b>
Physical Health	<b>2,699</b>	<b>,007</b>	<b>M+</b>
Work/School Life	2,748	,006	-
Feeling Safe	2,417	,016	-
Social Pressure	-1,170	,242	-
Time Allocation	,336	,737	-
Neighborhood Relation	-1,868	,062	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,287	,199	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	-,074	,941	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	<b>2,677</b>	<b>,008</b>	<b>M+</b>
Finding Home Sufficient	,274	,784	-
Being Volunteer	,497	,619	-
Spiritual Life	-,460	,645	-
Satisfaction with Education	1,577	,115	-
Having Tools/Equipment	1,291	,197	-
Well-Being	<b>2,583</b>	<b>,010</b>	<b>M+</b>

**Table-2a:** The Cross Tab of Monthly Personal Income in Regard of The Gender

			Gender		Total
			Man	Woman	
Monthly Personal Income	350 \$ and below	n	46	95	141
		% of Monthly Personal Income	32,6	67,4	100,0
		% of Gender	12,9	28,6	20,5
	351 - 700\$	n	109	118	227
		% of Monthly Personal Income	48,0	52,0	100,0
		% of Gender	30,5	35,5	32,9
	701 - 1.050\$	n	98	73	171
		% of Monthly Personal Income	57,3	42,7	100,0
		% of Gender	27,5	22,0	24,8
	1.051 - 1.400\$	n	44	22	66
		% of Monthly Personal Income	66,7	33,3	100,0
		% of Gender	12,3	6,6	9,6
	1.401\$ more	n	60	24	84
		% of Monthly Personal Income	71,4	28,6	100,0
		% of Gender	16,8	7,2	12,2
Total	n	357	332	689	
	% of Monthly Personal Income	51,8	48,2	100,0	
	% of Gender	100,0	100,0	100,0	

**Table 2b:** Cross Tab of Total of Family Income in Regard of The Gender

			Gender		Total
			Man	Woman	
Total Monthly Family Income	450\$ and below	n	50	43	93
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	53,8	46,2	100,0
		% of Gender	14,0	13,0	13,5
	451 - 900\$	n	95	115	210
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	45,2	54,8	100,0
		% of Gender	26,6	34,6	30,5
	901 - 1.350\$	n	64	71	135
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	47,4	52,6	100,0
		% of Gender	17,9	21,4	19,6
	1.351 - 1.800\$	n	61	46	107
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	57,0	43,0	100,0
		% of Gender	17,1	13,9	15,5
	1.801 - 2.250\$	n	38	26	64
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	59,4	40,6	100,0
		% of Gender	10,6	7,8	9,3
	2.251\$ and more	n	49	31	80
		% of Total of Monthly Family Income	61,3	38,8	100,0
		% of Gender	13,7	9,3	11,6
Total	n	357	332	689	
	% of Total of Monthly Family Income	51,8	48,2	100,0	
	% of Gender	100,0	100,0	100,0	

**Table 2c:** Cross Tab of Currently Employed Status and Gender

			Gender		Total
			Man	Woman	
Currently Employed Status	Yes	n	281	221	502
		% of Employed Status	56,0	44,0	100,0
		% of Gender	78,7	66,6	72,9
	No	n	76	111	187
		% of Employed Status	40,6	59,4	100,0
		% of Gender	21,3	33,4	27,1
Total	n	357	332	689	
	% of Employed Status	51,8	48,2	100,0	
	% of Gender	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The comparison of QoL factors according to the marital status of the participants is given in Table 3. As can be seen from the table, although there is no statistically significant difference according to marital status in the TQoL, there is no statistically significant difference according to the marital status variable except for Family Relationship, Feeling Safe, Neighborhood Relations, Spiritual Life, and Having Tool/Equipment.

**Table 3:** Comparison of The Factors of YK in regard of The Marital Status

Factors	t	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	1,186	,236	-
Family Relationship	<b>2,799</b>	<b>,005</b>	<b>M+</b>
Perceived Income Level	1,533	,126	-
Physical Health	-1,354	,176	-
Work/School Life	,622	,534	-
Feeling Safe	<b>-2,091</b>	<b>,037</b>	<b>S+</b>
Social Pressure	-,421	,674	-
Time Allocation	-,818	,414	-
Neighborhood Relation	<b>2,604</b>	<b>,009</b>	<b>M+</b>
Satisfaction with Living Environment	,290	,772	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	-,248	,804	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,421	,156	-
Finding Home Sufficient	,867	,386	-
Being Volunteer	,144	,886	-
Spiritual Life	<b>2,523</b>	<b>,012</b>	<b>M+</b>
Satisfaction with Education	,319	,750	-
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>2,631</b>	<b>,009</b>	<b>M+</b>
Well-Being	,605	,546	-

The comparison of YK according to the age of the participants is given in Table 4. As can be seen from the table, although there is no difference between the age groups in the TQoL, there is a statistically significant difference in sub-factors of Feeling Safe, Time Allocation, Satisfaction with the Living Environment, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with the Education, and Well Being according to the age range variable.

**Table 4:** Comparison of the QoL by Age

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	2,238	,063	-
Family Relationship	,925	,449	-
Perceived Income Level	2,184	,069	-
Physical Health	1,424	,224	-
Work/School Life	1,452	,215	-
Feeling Safe	<b>3,763</b>	<b>,005</b>	a-b, a-c, c-d, c-e, d-e
Social Pressure	,320	,864	-
Time Allocation	<b>3,436</b>	<b>,009</b>	b-d, b-e, c-d, c-e
Neighborhood Relation	2,593	,036	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	<b>4,199</b>	<b>,002</b>	b-d, b-e, c-e
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,537	,190	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	<b>4,729</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e
Finding Home Sufficient	1,461	,212	-
Being Volunteer	,701	,591	-
Spiritual Life	1,070	,370	-
Satisfaction with Education	<b>4,987</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-d, a-e, b-e, c-d, c-e
Having Tools/Equipment	2,094	,080	-
Well-Being	<b>4,001</b>	<b>,003</b>	a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-e

The comparison of QoL factors according to the monthly personal income of the participants is given in Table 5. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference according to monthly personal income. As personal income increases, the total YK value also increases. In addition, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to the monthly personal income variable in factors other than Social Pressure, Time Allocation, Satisfaction with Living Environment, Satisfaction with the Social Environment, and Being Volunteer.

**Table 5:** Comparison of QoL by Personal Income

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	<b>13,171</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-c, a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-d, c-e
Family Relationship	<b>3,525</b>	<b>,007</b>	a-d, a-e, b-e, c-e
Perceived Income Level	<b>29,588</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, a-d, a-e, b-c, b-d, b-e, c-d, c-e, d-e
Physical Health	<b>5,676</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-e, b-c, b-d, b-e, c-e
Work/School Life	<b>15,491</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-d, c-e
Feeling Safe	<b>6,403</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-e, b-c, b-d, b-e, c-e
Social Pressure	2,332	,054	-
Time Allocation	1,360	,246	-
Neighborhood Relation	<b>2,542</b>	<b>,039</b>	a-d, a-e, b-d
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,927	,104	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	0,546	,702	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	<b>4,910</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-d, a-e, b-e, c-e
Finding Home Sufficient	<b>2,463</b>	<b>,044</b>	a-e, b-e, c-e, d-e
Being Volunteer	1,435	,221	-
Spiritual Life	<b>6,124</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-d, c-e
Satisfaction with Education	<b>14,370</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, a-d, a-e, b-c, b-d, b-e, c-d
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>6,731</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-e

Well-Being	6,043	,000	a-c, a-d, a-e, b-d, b-e, c-e
------------	-------	------	------------------------------

The comparison of QoL factors according to the total monthly family income of the participants is given in Table 6. As can be seen from the table, similar to the situation in personal income, TQoL score differs statistically significantly according to the total family income variable. As the total family income increases, the TQoL score also increases. In addition, there is a statistically significant difference according to the total monthly income variable in the sub-factors other than Social Pressure, Satisfaction with the Living Environment, Satisfaction with the Social Environment and Being Volunteer.

**Table 6:** Comparison of QoL by Total of Monthly Family Income

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	12,830	,000	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-d, c-e
Family Relationship	5,944	,000	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-c, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-d, c-e
Perceived Income Level	33,395	,000	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e, b-f, b-c, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-d, c-e, c-f, d-f, e-f
Physical Health	4,893	,000	a-d, a-e, a-f, b-e, b-f, c-e, c-f
Work/School Life	5,161	,000	a-d, a-e, a-f, b-e, b-f, c-e, c-f
Feeling Safe	3,699	,003	a-d, a-e, a-f, b-e, b-f, c-e, c-f
Social Pressure	0,515	,765	-
Time Allocation	2,567	,026	a-d, a-e, a-f
Neighborhood Relation	2,412	,035	a-d, a-e, a-f, c-d, c-e, c-f
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,652	,144	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,927	,088	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	3,391	,005	a-f, b-f, c-f, d-f
Finding Home Sufficient	5,665	,000	a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-f, c-f, d-f
Being Volunteer	1,010	,410	-
Spiritual Life	4,757	,000	a-d, a-e, a-f, b-d, b-f, c-d, c-f
Satisfaction with Education	6,181	,000	a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-f
Having Tools/Equipment	10,801	,000	a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-d, c-e, c-f
Well-Being	5,049	,000	a-b, a-c, a-d, a-e, a-f, b-d, b-e, b-f, c-f

The comparison of YK according to the education level of the participants is given in Table 7. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score varies according to the education level with a statistically significant difference. As the education level increases, the TQoL score increases. When this difference is evaluated in terms of sub-factors of QoL, there is a statistically significant difference according to the educational level variable in the factors of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Work/School Life, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well Being. As the education level increases, the value of QoL sub-dimensions also increases.

**Table 7:** Comparison of QoL by Education Level

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	12,928	,000	a-b, a-c, b-c
Family Relationship	5,922	,003	a-b, a-c
Perceived Income Level	16,377	,000	a-c, b-c
Physical Health	17,812	,000	a-b, a-c, b-c
Work/School Life	8,533	,000	a-c, b-c
Feeling Safe	2,435	,088	-
Social Pressure	2,812	,061	-
Time Allocation	0,142	,868	-
Neighborhood Relation	1,237	,291	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	2,825	,060	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	2,650	,071	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	3,174	,042	a-c, b-c
Finding Home Sufficient	2,690	,069	-
Being Volunteer	1,714	,181	-
Spiritual Life	2,886	,056	-
Satisfaction with Education	56,551	,000	a-b, a-c, b-c
Having Tools/Equipment	3,699	,025	a-c, b-c
Well-Being	5,258	,005	a-c, b-c

The comparison of YK according to the current working status of the participants is given in Table 8. As can be seen from the table, currently, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of the employees in terms of Work/School Life, Time Allocation and Satisfaction with Education factors according to the work variable.

The comparison of YK according to the current working status of the participants is given in Table 18. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score does not change statistically according to the employment status of individuals. Besides, currently, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of the employees in terms of Work/School Life, Time Allocation and Satisfaction with Education sub-factors according to the work variable.

**Table 8:** Comparison of QoL by Currently Employed Status

Factors	t	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	1,115	,265	
Family Relationship	,793	,428	-
Perceived Income Level	,575	,566	-
Physical Health	1,082	,280	-
Work/School Life	5,576	,000	Y+
Feeling Safe	1,012	,312	-
Social Pressure	-1,226	,221	-
Time Allocation	-2,231	,026	N+
Neighborhood Relation	,990	,323	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	-1,504	,134	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	-1,184	,237	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,856	,064	-
Finding Home Sufficient	-,256	,798	-

Faik Ardahan  
COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SOME DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES

Being Volunteer	-,564	,573	-
Spiritual Life	1,366	,173	-
Satisfaction with Education	<b>2,140</b>	<b>,033</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Having Tools/Equipment	,401	,689	-
Well-Being	1,825	,069	-

The comparison of the SC according to the current working status of the participants is given in Table 9. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score varies according to the place of work; the difference is statistically significant, and the difference is against the unemployed, retired and students. When this difference is questioned in more detail, there is a statistically significant difference in the sub-factors of Perceived Income Level, Work/School Life, Feeling Safe, Time Allocation, Relationship with Neighborhood, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well-Being compared to the working variable in the current state and the difference is against the unemployed, retirees and students.

**Table 9:** Comparison of QoL by Working Place

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	<b>2,296</b>	<b>,033</b>	a-g, c-d, d-f, e-g, f-g
Family Relationship	1,337	,238	-
Perceived Income Level	<b>3,476</b>	<b>,002</b>	a-g, b-c, b-g, c-g, d-g, e-g, f-g
Physical Health	,744	,615	-
Work/School Life	<b>7,733</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-d, a-e, a-f, a-g, b-d, b-e, b-f, b-g, c-d, c-e, c-f, c-g, d-g, f-g
Feeling Safe	<b>3,209</b>	<b>,004</b>	a-g, b-g, c-g, d-g, e-g, f-g
Social Pressure	,494	,813	-
Time Allocation	<b>3,772</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-e, a-f, b-c, b-e, b-f, c-d, d-e, d-f
Neighborhood Relation	<b>2,974</b>	<b>,007</b>	a-b, a-d, b-e, c-d, d-e, d-f
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,776	,101	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	,755	,606	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	<b>3,040</b>	<b>,006</b>	a-d, b-d, c-d, d-e, d-f, d-g
Finding Home Sufficient	,957	,453	-
Being Volunteer	1,793	,098	-
Spiritual Life	1,594	,146	-
Satisfaction with Education	<b>7,030</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-d, a-e, a-g, b-c, b-f, c-d, c-e, c-g, d-f, e-f, f-g
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>2,614</b>	<b>,016</b>	a-c, a-e, c-d, c-g, d-e, d-f
Well-Being	<b>4,238</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-d, a-g, b-c, b-d, b-g, c-d, d-g d-e, d-g, e-g, f-g

The comparison of QoL according to the renting status of the participants to the house they live in is given in Table 10. As can be seen from the table, although the TQoL score does not change according to the renting status, among the sub-factors of YK, there is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Time Allocation, Neighborhood Relation, Having Tools/Equipment according to the variable of renting home.

The cross tab between Lease Living and Age is given in Table 10a, the cross tab with Employment Status is given in Table 10 b, and the cross tab with education status is given in Table 10c. As can be seen from Table-10a, most of the tenants are young, as can be seen from Table-10b, most of the tenants are working, and as can be seen from Table-10c, most of the tenants are well educated.

**Table 10:** Comparison of QoL by Paying Hire for The Home

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	1,821	,069	
Family Relationship	<b>3,712</b>	<b>,000</b>	<b>N+</b>
Perceived Income Level	<b>4,119</b>	<b>,000</b>	<b>N+</b>
Physical Health	<b>-2,218</b>	<b>,027</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Work/School Life	1,054	,292	-
Feeling Safe	,279	,780	-
Social Pressure	-,676	,499	-
Time Allocation	<b>2,004</b>	<b>,046</b>	<b>N+</b>
Neighborhood Relation	<b>2,063</b>	<b>,040</b>	<b>N+</b>
Satisfaction with Living Environment	,758	,449	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	-,131	,896	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	-,915	,361	-
Finding Home Sufficient	1,098	,273	-
Being Volunteer	-,394	,694	-
Spiritual Life	,830	,407	-
Satisfaction with Education	-,195	,846	-
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>2,972</b>	<b>,003</b>	<b>N+</b>
Well-Being	1,032	,303	-

**Table 10a:** The Cross Tab of Paying Hire for Home and Age

			Do you pay hire for home?		Total
			No	Yes	
Range of Age	Age 25 and younger	n	29	59	88
		% of Age	33,0	67,0	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	7,0	21,3	12,8
	Age 26-34	n	83	73	156
		% of Age	53,2	46,8	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	20,1	26,4	22,6
	Age 35-44	n	121	80	201
		% of Age	60,2	39,8	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	29,4	28,9	29,2
	Age 45-54	n	103	53	156
		% of Age	66,0	34,0	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	25,0	19,1	22,6
	Age 55 and older	n	76	12	88
		% of Age	86,4	13,6	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	18,4	4,3	12,8
Total	n	412	277	689	
	% of Age	59,8	40,2	100,0	
	% of Paying Hire	100,0	100,0	100,0	



**Table 10b:** The Cross Tab of Paying Hire for Home and Employed Status

			Do you pay hire for home?		Total
			No	Yes	
Employed Status	Yes	n	306	196	502
		% of Employed Status	61,0	39,0	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	74,3	70,8	72,9
	No	n	106	81	187
		% of Employed Status	56,7	43,3	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	25,7	29,2	27,1
Total	n	412	277	689	
	% of Employed Status	59,8	40,2	100,0	
	% of Paying Hire	100,0	100,0	100,0	

**Table 10c:** The Cross Tab of Paying Hire for House and Education Status

			Do you pay hire for home?		Total
			No	Yes	
Education Status	High School Equivalent and Lower	n	70	25	95
		% of Education Status	73,7	26,3	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	17,0	9,0	13,8
	Bachelor Degree	n	234	175	409
		% of Education Status	57,2	42,8	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	56,8	63,2	59,4
	Postgraduate Degree	n	108	77	185
		% of Education Status	58,4	41,6	100,0
		% of Paying Hire	26,2	27,8	26,9
Total	n	412	277	689	
	% of Education Status	59,8	40,2	100,0	
	% of Paying Hire	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The comparison of YK according to the property status of the house where you live is given in Table 11. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference between the groups according to the ownership of the house they live in. The difference is against those who stay somewhere other than home. When this difference is questioned in more detail in the sub-factors of QoL, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Time Allocation, Finding Home Sufficient, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment according to the property status of the house variable.

**Table 11:** Comparison of QoL by Ownership of the Home

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	2,389	,050	a-e, c-e
Family Relationship	6,206	,000	a-d, a-e, b-e, c-d, c-e, d-e
Perceived Income Level	6,943	,000	a-b, a-d, a-e
Physical Health	1,658	,158	-
Work/School Life	1,373	,242	-
Feeling Safe	,248	,911	-

## COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SOME DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES

Social Pressure	1,126	,343	-
Time Allocation	<b>3,109</b>	<b>,015</b>	a-e, b-e, c-e, d-e
Neighborhood Relation	1,173	,321	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	,930	,446	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,125	,344	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,168	,323	-
Finding Home Sufficient	<b>8,115</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-e, b-e, c-e, d-e
Being Volunteer	,144	,966	-
Spiritual Life	,800	,525	-
Satisfaction with Education	<b>3,477</b>	<b>,008</b>	a-b, b-d
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>4,127</b>	<b>,003</b>	a-b, a-d, a-e, b-e
Well-Being	,943	,438	-

The comparison of YK according to who the participants live with at home is given in Table 12. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score varies statistically significantly according to whom the individual lives at home. The difference stems from those who live at home with their family and those who live with their friends, and it is against those who live with their friends. As given in Table 12a, a significant part of those living with their friends are students. Comparing this difference to sub-factors of QoL according to whom the participants live at home, there is a statistically significant difference according to the ownership of the house in the factors of Family Relationship, Relationship with Neighbors, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment. This difference is in favor of those who live alone and with their families.

**Table 12:** Comparison of QoL by the Situation of the Individual with Whom at Home

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	<b>3,967</b>	<b>,019</b>	b-c
Family Relationship	<b>11,167</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, b-c
Perceived Income Level	2,082	,126	-
Physical Health	,479	,620	-
Work/School Life	,866	,421	-
Feeling Safe	,526	,591	-
Social Pressure	,452	,636	-
Time Allocation	1,345	,261	-
Neighborhood Relation	<b>10,316</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-c, b-c
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,342	,262	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,281	,278	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,513	,221	-
Finding Home Sufficient	<b>10,128</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, b-c
Being Volunteer	,435	,647	-
Spiritual Life	<b>3,989</b>	<b>,019</b>	a-c, b-c
Satisfaction with Education	1,141	,320	-
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>6,912</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-b, b-c
Well-Being	2,639	,072	-

**Table 12a:** The Cross Tab of Business Place and Whom they live with

			Whom they live with			Total
			Alone	With friends	With family	
Business Place	Public Sector	Count	46	5	178	229
		% Whom they live with	37,7%	11,4%	34,0%	33,2%
	Private Sector	Count	30	6	156	192
		% Whom they live with	24,6%	13,6%	29,8%	27,9%
	Self-Employed/ Own Business	Count	11	5	65	81
		% Whom they live with	9,0%	11,4%	12,4%	11,8%
	Student	Count	16	27	27	70
		% Whom they live with	13,1%	61,4%	5,2%	10,2%
	House-wife	Count	0	0	24	24
		% Whom they live with	,0%	,0%	4,6%	3,5%
	Retired	Count	14	1	56	71
		% Whom they live with	11,5%	2,3%	10,7%	10,3%
	Unemployed	Count	5	0	17	22
		% Whom they live with	4,1%	,0%	3,3%	3,2%
Total		Count	122	44	523	689
		% Whom they live with	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

The comparison of YK according to the number of people living at home is given in Table 13. As can be seen from the table, although the TQoL score does not change according to the number of individuals living at home, one of the sub-factors of QoL, there is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship, Neighborhood Relation according to the number of individuals living at home. This difference is in favor of those who live in crowded homes. As given in Table 13a, there is a balance between the number of people living in the house and the size of the house. Many families/individuals live in a house suitable for family size.

**Table 13:** Comparison of QoL by the Number of Individuals Living at Home

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	,327	,721	
Family Relationship	<b>6,306</b>	<b>,002</b>	a-b, a-c, b-c
Perceived Income Level	,716	,489	-
Physical Health	1,604	,202	-
Work/School Life	,023	,977	-
Feeling Safe	,024	,976	-
Social Pressure	,383	,682	-
Time Allocation	,455	,635	-
Neighborhood Relation	<b>4,499</b>	<b>,011</b>	a-b, a-c
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,506	,223	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,804	,165	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,069	,344	-
Finding Home Sufficient	1,595	,204	-
Being Volunteer	,041	,960	-
Spiritual Life	1,525	,218	-
Satisfaction with Education	,488	,614	-

Faik Ardahan  
COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SOME DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES

Having Tools/Equipment	,173	,841	-
Well-Being	,165	,848	-

**Table-13a:** The Cross Tab of Number of Rooms in Lived Home and People Living in The Home

			Number of People + Living in Home			
			1	2-4	5 and more	Total
Number of Rooms in the Home	1+0 - 1+1	n	23	20	0	43
		% of Number of Rooms	53,5	46,5	,0	100,0
		% of People Living in Home	20,4	3,8	,0	6,2
	2+1 - 3+1	n	85	417	28	530
		% of Number of Rooms	16,0	78,7	5,3	100,0
		% of People Living in Home	75,2	78,2	65,1	76,9
	4+1 - 5+1	n	5	88	13	106
		% of Number of Rooms	4,7	83,0	12,3	100,0
		% of People Living in Home	4,4	16,5	30,2	15,4
	6+1 and more	n	0	8	2	10
		% of Number of Rooms	,0	80,0	20,0	100,0
		% of People Living in Home	,0	1,5	4,7	1,5
Total	n	113	533	43	689	
	% of Number of Rooms	16,4	77,4	6,2	100,0	
	% of People Living in Home	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0	

The comparison of QoL according to the number of rooms in the house where the participants live is given in Table 14. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score changes positively according to the number of rooms in the house, and the difference is statistically significant. When this change is questioned according to the sub-factors of the QoL, there is a statistically significant difference according to the number of rooms in the living house in the factors of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Neighborhood Relation, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well Being. As the number of rooms in the house increases, the total YK value and the sub-dimensions of the QoL also increase.

**Table 14:** Comparison of QoL by The Number of Rooms in Home

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	<b>6,688</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, a-d, b-c, b-d, b-d
Family Relationship	<b>6,744</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, b-d
Perceived Income Level	<b>8,785</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-c, a-d, b-c, b-d
Physical Health	1,048	,371	-
Work/School Life	2,249	,081	-
Feeling Safe	2,101	,099	-
Social Pressure	,601	,615	-
Time Allocation	2,471	,061	-
Neighborhood Relation	<b>5,299</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, b-c
Satisfaction with Living Environment	,360	,782	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	1,625	,182	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	1,214	,304	-
Finding Home Sufficient	<b>13,631</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, b-c, b-d

Faik Ardahan  
COMPARISON OF QUALITY OF LIFE ACCORDING TO SOME DEMOGRAPHICS VARIABLES

Being Volunteer	1,293	,276	-
Spiritual Life	<b>5,247</b>	<b>,001</b>	a-c, a-d, b-d
Satisfaction with Education	2,270	,079	-
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>8,052</b>	<b>,000</b>	a-b, a-c, a-d, b-c, b-d
Well-Being	<b>2,720</b>	<b>,044</b>	a-d

The comparison of QoL according to the situation of having a private room belonging to the individual in the house where the participants live is given in Table 15. As can be seen from the table, TQoL score varies according to whether the individual has his/ her own room in the house where s/he lives and gives a statistically significant difference in favor of those who have a private room. When this difference is questioned according to the sub-factors of the SQoL, there is a statistically significant difference in the Perceived Income Level, Finding Home Sufficient, Having Tools/Equipment according to the presence of a private room of the individual in the house where the participants live. The difference is in favor of those who have a private room.

**Table 15:** Comparison of QoL by Existence of a Room Belonging to The Individual

Factors	F	p	Comparison Results
TQoLoL	<b>2,330</b>	<b>,020</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Family Relationship	,556	,579	-
Perceived Income Level	<b>3,187</b>	<b>,002</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Physical Health	1,559	,121	-
Work/School Life	1,705	,090	-
Feeling Safe	1,807	,071	-
Social Pressure	,302	,763	-
Time Allocation	1,946	,053	-
Neighborhood Relation	,158	,875	-
Satisfaction with Living Environment	1,945	,052	-
Satisfaction with Social Environment	,910	,364	-
Perceived Environmental Safety	,049	,961	-
Finding Home Sufficient	<b>5,405</b>	<b>,000</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Being Volunteer	-,356	,722	-
Spiritual Life	,684	,495	-
Satisfaction with Education	-,016	,988	-
Having Tools/Equipment	<b>2,080</b>	<b>,039</b>	<b>Y+</b>
Well-Being	1,573	,117	-

## 5. Discussion

According to the results of the research, there is no significant difference between the groups in terms of participation, gender, age, and marital status, which will negatively affect the statistical comparisons. 75.9% of the participants in the study live with their families, 77.4% 2-4 people live in the same house, 76.9% live in a 2 + 1 - 3 + 1 house, 40.5% 38.6% of them live in a rented house, 17.6% of them live in a family house, 81.9% have a room of their own in the house where they live, 86.3% have a university or higher education, 33.2% of them work in the public sector, 27.9% in the private sector, 53.4%

have a personal income of 700\$ or less, and 63.6% have a total monthly family income of 1.350\$ or less.

Although the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference according to gender, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared by gender, except for Perceived Income, Physical Health, Perceived Environmental Safety, and Well-Being factors, there is a statistically significant difference according to gender variable, and the difference is in favor of male participants. The reason why the Perceived Income Level is in favor of men is that men have a higher rate of work and a higher income than women. In addition, as emphasized in the studies of Torlak and Yavuzçevre (2008), it is due to the fact that women who do not work depend on their husbands for their social security.

The most important reason for the statistically significant difference in the Physical Health factor is that the physical structures of men are stronger than women, the change in the perceived health expectancy in recent years, the spread of fitness centers, the change in conscious nutrition perception has led to the desire of women and men to invest more in their physical health. However, women's roles in both domestic and business life and the role of motherhood, which is added to this, have made women more disadvantaged in this regard. When all these factors come together, women are disadvantaged by men, according to the Physical Health Factor. As Ardahan (2013a) stated, although women wanted to go to fitness centers for health reasons compared to men, as discussed in AREM's (2007) study, the work-life balance of women compared to men was Less work-life balance creates a more disadvantageous situation compared to women in Perceived Income Level and Physical Health.

Men find the security of the living environment higher than women. This is expected. In particular, the increase in violence against women, the increase in harassment incidents, and their more coverage in social media and normal media than before have caused women to perceive the environment in which they live as less safe. This situation is stated in Ardahan (2014a) study; feeling physically weak against men causes this anxiety to be more in women.

Although many studies have stated that women are happier than men (Ardahan, 2018b), in this study, the statistically significant difference in the Well-Being factor is in favor of men. The reasons for this difference are that men can control their stress better, they can express themselves better, they feel better mentally, the income of men is higher than women, men have a higher employment rate than women, and men work under better conditions than women.

Although the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference according to marital status, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared according to marital status, there is a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Family Relationship, Feeling Safe, Neighborhood Relationship, Spiritual Life, and Having Tools/Equipment, and the difference is in favor of married individuals in sub-factors other than Feeling Safe factor.

A statistically significant difference in Family Relationship factor is in favor of married people, as expected. In many studies, meaningful and satisfying marriage, the quality of communication and interaction among family members make marriage more

important as a social institution (Diener, 2000; Helliwell, 2003; Bjørnskov *et al.*, 2008; Ardahan, 2012, 2016, 2018a, 2018b).

The statistically significant difference in the Feeling Safe factor is against married people. This result is not expected or desired. The priority / urgency level of needs and needs, which are in the third level of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, makes it necessary for people to live a happy and satisfied life (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016). Married people bear not only their own responsibilities but also the responsibilities of their spouses and their children. If their children grow up, their expenses increase as the children grow up, and medium and long-term borrowing situations such as buying a house and buying a car are caused by the concerns of married individuals not being able to maintain their current income level in the future in their current jobs and offices.

A statistically significant difference in Neighborhood Relationship factor is against singles. This result is expected. In general, singles do not (can) form meaningful relationships with their neighbors, especially the neighborhood relationship is stronger among married families. This result coincides with the result of Ardahan's (2013b) study.

The statistically significant difference in the Spiritual Life factor is in favor of married people. This result is expected. Because a meaningful, fulfilling marriage and healthy family relationship should enable individuals to express themselves better and live their spiritual preferences and expectations more freely (Diener, 2000).

The statistically significant difference in Having Tool/Equipment factor is in favor of married people. This result is expected. Marriage and family: in order to maintain daily life, individuals' hobby life, having the tools/equipment they need, sharing these items, buying tools/equipment in solidarity, borrowing the needed tools/equipment from others due to the stronger neighborhood and social relations both provides and increases this process.

Although the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference according to the age variable, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared according to the age variable, there is a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Feeling Safe, Time Allocation, Satisfaction with Living Environment, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with Education and Being Well-Being.

The statistically significant difference in the Feeling Safe factor stems from the fact that young people under the age of 25 feel safe and that the future concerns of individuals between the ages of 35 and 44 are reflected in their families. The important reason why individuals over the age of 55 experience less future anxiety than individuals in the other age range is that they see the desired confidence in their work and do not have anxiety for the future. This is actually not an expected situation. Individuals should feel safe at every age level within the understanding of the social state, and it is important that this happens. Individuals under 25 years old are just at the beginning of their lives and take on only their individual responsibilities. As age increases, individuals' increasing responsibilities such as marriage, spouse and children are one of the important reasons why individuals worry about the future.

The statistically significant difference in the Time Allocation factor is in favor of individuals under 25 and 45 and over. These individuals can spare enough time for themselves, their families, their hobbies, and individuals in their social world. The intensive work lives of individuals between the ages of 26-44 cause them to work more intensively due to their high future concerns, and family roles such as having a child and the responsibility of taking care of the child take a significant part of their free time.

The statistically significant difference in Satisfaction with the Living Environment factor is in favor of young people and elderly individuals. The fact that young people have just started to live in the environment they live in now is due to their desire to live in the current place in the future, and elderly individuals have been living in the same environment for a long time. The main reason for moving from a nomadic life to a settled life is that the current place meets the life expectancies of the individuals. In the study of Aydiner Boylu (2007), with the increase in income, the income earned by individuals increases as their age increases and the satisfaction with the living environment and the house they own increases.

The statistically significant difference in the Perceived Environmental Safety factor is against young people aged 25 and under. This difference is due to the fact that women under the age of 25 do not perceive the neighborhood/environment where they live as safe. In Ardahan's (2013b) study, it was found that the perceived security of the environment inhabited increases as the age increases. Creating an environment in which young people, children, and especially young women/children feel safe should be a primary duty of all adults/empowered persons/institutions.

The statistically significant difference in the Satisfaction with Education Factor is against individuals aged 44 and under. The main purpose of education is to provide the professional formation that will take the individual to where s/he wants to be in the future and prepare him/her to live the life s/he dreams of. The fact that individuals under the age of 44 have little belief that they can achieve this at the current educational level creates this difference. Although the relationship between education and age is not direct, it is most directly related to income. Education is also one of the important determinants of personal income and total monthly family income. In general, it also enables people with higher education levels to have higher income, more qualified, more social opportunities and naturally higher QoL (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008).

The statistically significant difference in the well-being factor is against individuals aged 44 and under. This difference is due to the inability of individuals under the age of 44 to cope with stress sufficiently, to express themselves at the desired satisfaction and level, and to feel mentally unwell due to the arrangement of many other living areas. In addition to these, Ardahan *et al.* (2016) stated that the progress of individuals in their professional and social careers at this age may cause pressure and stress in individuals. At the same time, long-term borrowing, such as being a family, getting married, having and raising children, and buying a house-car, is one of the factors that cause strain for individuals. All of these affect the well-being of the individual. In addition, Diener (2000) stated that as age increases, the individual feels good, learns to



live and solve problems, is more successful in these matters, and life satisfaction increases. These findings coincide with the results of the present study.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variables of personal income and total family monthly income, the Total YK score shows a statistically significant difference in favor of individuals with an income of 6001 TL and above. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of the QoL are compared with the personal income variable, Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Work/School Life, Feeling Safe, Neighborhood Relationship, Perceived Environmental Safety, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment and Well-Being, there is a statistically significant difference. When the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the family total monthly income variable, there is a statistically significant difference in the Time Allocation sub-dimension in favor of individuals in the high-income group, in addition to the sub-factors that differ in the personal income variable.

In the Family Relationship factor, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of the high-income group according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income increases, the score of the Family Relations factor also increases. In this situation, those who have a personal income of 1.050\$ or less, those with a monthly personal income group of 1.400\$ and above, those with a monthly income of 450\$ or less, and those with a higher total monthly family income of 451 - 900\$, have a higher total monthly family income. and those with a total monthly family income of 901 - 1.350\$ and above. These differences are not expected. Regardless of monthly personal income in family relationships, meaningful and fulfilling family relationships are similar in people of all income levels. Even a healthy family relationship should bring along more solidarity while overcoming difficulties. However, the fact that the Family Relationship factor is high in people in this income group can only be explained by the fact that individuals and/or families in the high-income group will have a more life supported by cultural underlays and worldviews that will strengthen family relations. The positive relationship between participation in recreation and income level may be the most important scientific fact that makes this fact meaningful (Ardahan *et al.* 2016).

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of the high-income group according to the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income variable in the Perceived Income Level factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increase, the score of the Perceived Income Level factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation. As stated in the literature, the linear relationship between income and QoL has also been found in the present study. As the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, the budget allocated to many needs levels and purchasing items in Maslow's pyramid, individual feeling safe, health, education, housing, transportation, physical, emotional and social health also increases. (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Aydiner Boylu, 2007; Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2017). As countries, societies, individuals and/or families become poorer, they will have lower QoL compared to those in the higher-income group (Cılga, 1994).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Physical Health factor in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income increases, the score of the Physical Health factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation. As stated in the literature, there is a linear relationship between income and QoL, and it may be due to many factors such as seeing one's own physical needs, being able to do daily life activities such as walking, running, climbing stairs, carrying, and having health insurance (Demirkaya, 2010; Tüzün and Eker, 2003; Yancar , 2005; Yapıcı, 2006; Bilir *et al.*, 2005; Aydın Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2017). Current research findings also support these results. As the monthly personal income increases, the individual invests more in his own physical health, as it is given in Table 17, the increase in the awareness of individuals about physical health with the increase of their education level also predicts this result.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Work/School Life factor in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, the score of the Work/School Life factor also increases. It is expected that as the monthly personal income increases, the satisfaction of the individual with the work/school environment and QoL increases. As stated in the literature (Aydın Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016), the linear relationship between income and QoL was also found in the present study.

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to the monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable in the Feeling Safe factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increase, the score of the Feeling Secure factor also increases. As the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, it is expected that the individual will feel safe (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016). This difference is mostly due to the difference between individuals with a monthly personal income of 700\$ or less and individuals with a monthly personal income of 1.400\$ and above, and the difference between families with a total family income of 1.350\$ or less and families with an income of 1.801\$ and above. These results are consistent with the literature.

In the Time Allocation factor, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to the variable of total family monthly income. According to the findings, as the total monthly income of the family increases, the score of the Time Allocation factor also increases. This difference is mostly due to the low Time Allocation scores of people with a monthly income of 450\$ and below, low-income housewives, retired, unemployed and working with minimum wage, including students. Although this result is undesirable, but unfortunately, it is an expected situation. This result is probably not directly due to income. Lower age, lower education level, low awareness of living well and inexperience in time management may have an effect on this result.

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable in the Neighborhood Relationship factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increase, the score of the Neighborhood Relationship factor also increases. Although this result is undesirable, it is an expected situation. This difference is mostly due to the low neighborhood scores of the students. The expected situation is that people of all income levels have meaningful and satisfying neighborhood relationships. But the facts of life often do not confirm this. Ardahan (2014a) did not find a significant difference in the neighborhood relationships of individuals according to income. On the other hand, Ardahan (2014b) found in his study that the fact that students have good neighborly relations, especially in Turkish society, will positively affect their academic achievements and QoL. The results support the current research results.

There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived Safe Environment factor in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increase, the score of the Perceived Safe Environment factor also increases. Ardahan (2014a) found a significant difference in the Perceived Safe Environment factor of individuals according to income in his study. This difference is expected, and it is mostly due to male students not perceiving the environment they live in as safe. As the income of individuals increases, they buy the houses they live in from places where they think the environment is safe or from sites that have security, and this situation makes themselves and/or their family feel safe in the place of residence (Aydiner Boylu, 2007).

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable in Finding Home Sufficient factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, the score of finding the Finding Home Sufficient factor also increases. As can be seen in Table 5, this difference is mostly due to the size of the house inhabited and the number of family members. Individuals having a room of their own positively affect QoL (Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Spiritual Life factor compared to the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income variable in favor of the high-income groups. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income increases, the score of the Spiritual Life factor also increases. The mentioned difference is between individuals with a monthly personal income of 350 \$ or less, 351 - 700\$ and 701 - 1.050\$ monthly personal income, individuals with a monthly personal income of 1.051\$ and above, those with a total family income of 1.350\$ or less, and a total family of 1.351\$ and above. Although this difference is not directly related to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income, the level of spiritual life satisfaction increases with the age, education level and job status of individuals (Ardahan, 2012, 2016, 2018a, 2018b).

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable in Satisfaction with Education Factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, the score of the Satisfaction with the Education Received factor also increases. This difference is due to the difference between individuals with a monthly personal income of 350 \$ or less, 351 - 700\$ and 701 - 1.050\$ monthly personal income and individuals with a monthly personal income of 1.051\$ and above, and those with a total family income of 1.350\$ or less and those with a total family income of 1.351\$ and above. Although this difference is not directly related to the monthly personal income, the age, education level, and job status of the individuals increase, and the level of satisfaction with the education received increases.

There is a statistically significant difference in favor of high-income groups according to the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income variable in the Having Tool/Equipment factor. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or the total monthly family income increases, the score of the Having Tool/Equipment factor also increases, and this is an expected situation. With the increase in the personal monthly income and/or the total monthly family income of the individuals, the budget and purchasing power they allocate for the tools/equipment they need in their lives will also increase. This difference arises from the difference between individuals with a personal income of 350 \$ or less, 351 - 700\$ and 701 - 1.050\$ in personal monthly income, and individuals with a personal income of 1.051\$ and above. This difference is due to the difference between those who have a family income of 1.350\$ or less and those who have a total family income of 1.351\$ and above in terms of total monthly family income. In addition, as can be seen from Table 11, the difference is mostly caused by the difference between those who live with their friends and those who live alone in the family environment. This largely indicates single homes where students live. This result overlaps with the study of Ardahan *et al.* (2016). Their study coincides with the discussion that is generally accepted in the literature that the income of individuals increases with the increase in the budget allocated for more living that is qualified.

There is a statistically significant difference in the well-being factor in favor of high-income groups according to monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income variable. According to the findings, as the monthly personal income and/or total monthly family income increases, the score of the well-being factor also increases. This difference is in terms of personal income among individuals with a monthly personal income of 350 \$ or less, 351 - 700\$ and 701 - 1.050\$. In terms of total monthly family income, this difference is between individuals with a monthly personal income of 1.051\$ and above, those with a total family income of 1.350\$ or less, and individuals with a total family income of 1.351\$ and above. The more people spend on products that make them feel good, the more satisfaction they will gain (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016). Increasing these expenditures with the increase in the income of the individual will make a difference in favor of individuals with high income.

When the TQoL score is compared with the educational level variable, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference in favor of well-educated individuals. In

addition, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the education level variable, there are statistically significant differences in favor of well-educated individuals in the sub-dimensions of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Work/School Life, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with Education, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well-Being.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Family Relationship factor according to the education level variable. This difference is due to the difference in the scores of the individuals with an education level of high school equivalent and below, as well as the individuals with undergraduate and higher education levels. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Family Relations factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation, and the level of education increases the awareness of quality life, quality life expectancy, the ability to construct and maintain healthy relationships, and the emotional intelligence of individuals (Ardahan, 2012; Ardahan *et al.*, 2016). The results of the present study coincide with the results in the literature.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Perceived Income Level factor according to the education level variable. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Perceived Income Level factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation, and as the education level of individuals increases, the chance of finding a job in higher positions and with higher wages or advancement in their current jobs will increase (Aydiner Boylu & Paçacıoğlu, 2016). This difference is due to the difference in the scores of the individuals who are high school equivalent and below, those who are at the undergraduate education level, and those at the graduate/doctorate education level. It is also expected that there will be a significant difference between those who normally have a high school equivalent or less than those with undergraduate education. Unfortunately, the fact that undergraduate graduates in our country are employed with wages paid to individuals with a high school education level prevents this difference from occurring. From another point of view, the insufficient undergraduate education level may have caused this.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Physical Health factor according to the educational level variable. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Physical Health factor also increases. This difference is due to the difference in the scores of the individuals who are high school-equivalent and below and who are at the undergraduate education level and the individuals at the graduate/doctorate education level. This difference is expected, and as the education level of individuals increases, it is expected that health and nutritional awareness will increase, and investment in physical health will increase in direct proportion to income. The main purpose of education is to give the awareness of living better in addition to vocational training (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). It is also expected that there will be a significant difference between those who normally have a high school-equivalent or less than those with undergraduate education. While we cannot see this between high school-equivalent and undergraduate education, we can see it in individuals with postgraduate/doctorate education.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Work/School Life factor according to the education level variable. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Work/School Life factor also increases. Work/School Life also determines the level of satisfaction individuals have with their work or school. This difference is an expected situation, and as the education level of individuals increases, students' feelings of satisfaction with their schools and employees' jobs increase (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Aydıner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). This difference is due to the difference in the scores of the individuals who are high school-equivalent and below and who are at the undergraduate education level and the individuals at the graduate/doctorate education level. The main purpose of education is to increase awareness of living better, besides vocational training. As with the Satisfaction with Education Factor, it is expected that there will be a significant difference between those with a high school-equivalent or less than those with undergraduate education. While we cannot see this between high school-equivalent and undergraduate education, we can see it in individuals with postgraduate / doctorate education.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Perceived Environmental Safety factor according to the educational level variable. This difference is due to the difference in the scores of the individuals who are high school equivalent and below, those who are at the undergraduate education level, and those at the graduate/doctorate education level. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Perceived Environmental Safety factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation. As the education level of individuals increases, it is expected that they will desire and expect to live in a safer environment for themselves, for family members, and especially for children (Ardahan, 2014a). As given in Table 5 and Table 6, as the education level increases, the relative increase of the personal income levels and family income levels of the individuals also shows that the individuals are willing and ready to spend money for a safer environment. For these reasons, the increase in income predicts an increase in the Perceived Environmental Safety factor score.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Satisfaction with the Education factor according to the education level variable. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Satisfaction with the Education factor also increases. This difference is expected, and as the education level of the individuals increases, it is expected that the satisfaction of the individuals with the education they receive will increase. While the aim of high school education is to prepare the individual for life and university life, the main purpose of undergraduate education is to provide vocational education. In addition to job and professional satisfaction, education also determines which job an individual has, what his/her income will be, what his/her status will be in society depending on his/her job status, and the opportunity and confidence to find a new job if s/he loses his/her job (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Aydıner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). Findings support this situation. In other words, the higher QoL expectations that individuals want to have in the present and future are directly related to the education they receive. Qualified education can largely guarantee higher QoL.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Having Tool/Equipment factor according to the education level variable. According to the findings, as the level of education increases, the score of the Having Tool/Equipment factor also increases. As can be seen in Table 5 and Table 6, the difference is due to the high income of the individuals at the Master's/Doctorate level. This difference is not expected directly from the education level. As the education level of individuals increases, the increase in their personal income and total family income ensures that more shares are allocated from the total budget for the needed tools/equipment. This naturally shows that as the level of education increases, the budget allocated for the tools/equipment has increased.

There is a statistically significant difference in the well-being factor according to the educational level variable. According to the findings, as the education level increases, the score of the Well-Being factor also increases. This difference is an expected situation. As the education level of individuals increases, problem-solving skills, the ability to control their own and others' emotions and impulses, and the increase in awareness and expectation of quality-of-life increase. These are the possible reasons for this difference in education level. Ardahan (2012, 2016, 2018a, 2018b) found similar results as the life satisfaction of individuals increases as the education level increases.

When the TQoL score is compared with the current employment variable, the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference. However, there is a statistically significant difference in the sub-dimensions of Work/School Life, Time Allocation, and Satisfaction with Education according to the current employment status. This difference is in favor of those who do not work in the Time Allocation sub-factor, and those who work in others.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Work/School Life factor according to the working status variable. According to the findings, if individuals are employed, their satisfaction with work/school life also increases. This is expected. In other words, working in a desired job, studying at a school, or even having a job most of the time positively affects the QoL of the individual and the family (Demiral, 2001).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Time Allocation factor according to the current working status variable. According to the findings, if individuals are employed, their time allocation score decreases. In other words, individuals' allocating a certain period of time to their work/school life, social life, and personal life requires more effective and effective time management. Working for individuals who can achieve this affects QoL positively, but it negatively affects QoL for those who fail (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Satisfaction with Education factor according to the current working status variable. According to the findings, the employment status of individuals also increases their satisfaction with the education received. This is expected. In other words, being satisfied with the education they receive increases the chances of being employed in a job in line with their own income and self-realization expectations (Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008; Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). This, naturally, positively affects the job satisfaction and YK of the working individuals in the place where they work.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of place of work, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference against the unemployed individuals. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the educational level variable, Perceived Income Level, Work/School Life, Feeling Safe, Time Allocation, Neighborhood Relation, Perceived Environmental Safety, Satisfaction with Education, Tools/Equipment and Well-Being, there is a statistically significant difference against unemployment and student individuals in sub-dimensions.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Perceived Income Level factor according to the variable of place of work. According to the findings, the fact that the employment status of the individuals causes the individuals to have high personal and/or total family income increases the satisfaction of the individual with the perceived income. This is expected. In other words, being an unemployed student and/or housewife means being dependent on someone else for income. This means a lower income level and lower QoL for individuals in this situation (Demiral, 2001).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Work/School Life factor according to the variable of place of work. The situation of individuals not working anywhere, according to the findings, causes students, housewives, retired and unemployed individuals to be less satisfied with their work/school life. This is expected. In other words, being unemployed or unemployed means lower job/school life satisfaction and YK (Demiral, 2001).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Feeling Safe factor according to the place of work variable. According to the findings, individuals' state of being employed and earning personal income increases the feeling of feeling safe. This is expected. In other words, it does not seem possible for unemployed individuals to feel safe in the medium and long term (Demiral, 2001).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Time Allocation factor according to the variable of the current place of work. According to the findings, if the individuals are employed and do not have competence in time management, the score of sparing time for themselves, their family, social life and hobbies is also low. Findings in literature also support this (Ardahan, 1998, 2004; Demiral, 2001). Being unemployed, retiring and being a housewife is more advantageous than employees in sparing time. In other words, individuals' devoting a certain period of time to business life requires more effective and effective time management. While working for individuals who can achieve this affects Qo positively, it negatively affects Qo for those who fail (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016).

There is a statistically significant difference in the Neighborhood Relationship factor according to the variable of the place of study. According to the findings, the fact that individuals are housewives makes it more advantageous to establish a neighborhood relationship. This is expected. Working, especially women's work, negatively affects the neighborhood relationship. In addition, not living in the same building for a long time also negatively affects the failure to establish and/or maintain a neighborly relationship. (Ardahan, 2013b). This result of the study coincides with the results in the literature.



There is a statistically significant difference in the Satisfaction with Education factor according to the variable of the place of work. According to the findings, where individuals are employed and/or their employment status increases according to the place they work. This is an expected situation. Being a housewife, being unemployed, private sector employee and being a student decrease satisfaction with the education received. In other words, being satisfied with the education they receive increases the individuals' chances of being employed in a job in line with their own income and self-realization expectations (Demiral, 2001; Torlak and Yavuzçehre, 2008). This naturally affects the satisfaction of the working individuals from the training received and the YK positively.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Having Tool/Equipment factor according to the place of work variable. According to the findings, housewives are more advantageous than other employees in terms of having tool equipment. This is expected because housewives spend most of their lives at home doing housework. The lack of any tools/equipment in the house will naturally affect her QoL. In addition to this, although it is much more closely related to the budget that individuals allocate from their income to tools/equipment, the fact that housewives have the tools/equipment they need for daily work in the living house has a more positive effect on the QoL of those individuals.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Well-Being factor according to the variable of place of work. According to the findings, the fact that individuals are unemployed and students makes them more disadvantaged in terms of their well-being or well-being (Demiral, 2001). This is expected. Being unemployed creates a negative situation both in terms of economic income/satisfaction and in terms of job satisfaction and professional satisfaction (Ardahan *et al.*, 2016; (Demiral, 2001; Torlak & Yavuzçehre, 2008). The results of the study support these results in the literature.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of renting out the house, the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference. However, there is a statistically significant difference in Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Physical Health, Time Allocation, Neighborhood Relationship, and Tools/Equipment sub-dimensions of QoL according to the renting status of the living house. This difference is in favor of those who rent the house in the Physical Health sub-dimension and those who do not rent in others.

There is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship and Perceived Income according to the renting status of the house where the participants live. Although the family relationship is not related to renting, this may also be reflected in family relationships as it will force individuals to continue their lives with a higher budget and the decrease in income due to renting, or from another point of view, living with a high budget may reduce the opportunities that individuals can spare for themselves or reward themselves. This may reduce the family solidarity of individuals. The fact that significant portions of the residents are students and/or those living separately from their families may be one of the important reasons for the low family relationship score. In order to overcome the financial burden that individuals bear while

buying a house and the welfare lost in the repayment process, their solidarity with their spouses and other family members strengthens family relations.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Physical Health factor according to the renting status of the participants to the house they live in. As a primary parameter, the significant difference between Physical Health and leasing the home is not a related and expected situation. The important reason may be that the tenants are young, and their physical health is good, as shown in Table 10a.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Time Allocation factor according to the renting status of the house where the participants live. As a primary parameter, the significant difference between Time Allocation and leasing to the residential house is not a related and expected situation. The important reasons for this could be that the renters are young as given in Table-10a, they work as given in Table-10b, and they can manage time effectively due to their high education level as given in Table-10c.

In the Neighborhood Relationship factor, there is a statistically significant difference according to the renting status of the house where the participants live. This is expected. Not renting a house means that the house belongs to the individual or a close family member and those they live/have been living there for a long time. Neighborhood relationships are a social structure that increases with more home ownership. Except for those who have lived in the same house for a long time in tenancy, it is not possible to establish a sufficient neighborhood relationship.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Vehicle / Equipment Factor according to the renting status of the house where the participants live. This is expected. Not renting a house means that the house belongs to the individual or a close family member, lives there or can live for a long time. Individuals can invest more in the house they will live in and can buy both their hobbies and the tools/equipment they need. At the same time, the high Neighborhood Relationship makes it easier to borrow tools/equipment from others when necessary. This is also an important element. In tenancy, it is possible to continue life with the minimum possible tools/equipment as it provides ease of moving and settlement. For this reason, tenants live with less stuff.

When the TQoL score is compared with the homeownership variable, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference against individuals living outside the home. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of the QoL are compared with the ownership of the house variable, there is a statistically significant difference against individuals living outside the home in the sub-dimensions of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Time Allocation, Finding Home Sufficient, Satisfaction with Education, and Having Tools/Equipment.

There is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship, Time Allocation, and Finding a Finding Home Sufficient according to the ownership status of the house where the participants live. This is expected. This difference is mostly to the detriment of those who stay outside the home. This largely describes those staying in places such as student dormitories, guesthouses, and hotels.

In the Perceived Income Level factor, there is a statistically significant difference according to the ownership status of the house where the participants live. This is expected. This difference is mostly in favor of those who stay in their own home. The fact that the individuals living in their own homes are far from the expenses that place a lot of burden on the budget, such as rent, allows them to allocate their budgets more easily to other needs and this naturally affects the QoL of the individuals positively.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Satisfaction with Education factor according to the ownership status of the house where the participants live. It is not a situation that describes a primary relationship between these variables. This situation is affected by factors such as an individual's income, employment status, place of employment, and education level. The high income of those who are satisfied with the education they received and the fact that they live in the house they own show that there is a positive interaction between these variables to a large extent.

There is a statistically significant difference in the Having Tools/Equipment factor according to the ownership status of the house where the participants live. This is expected. The fact that the house belongs to him or a relative means s/he can live there for a long time. Individuals can buy more tools/equipment into the house where they will live permanently. At the same time, as it is given in Table 10, the high neighborhood relationship increases the borrowing of tools/ equipment from others when necessary. This is also an important element. In tenancy, it is possible to continue life with the minimum possible tools/equipment as it provides ease of moving and settlement.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of the situation with whom the individual lives at home, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference against the individuals living with their friends. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the variable with whom the individual lives at home, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of individuals living with the family in the sub-dimensions of Family Relationship, Neighborhood Relation, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, and Having Tools/Equipment.

There is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship, Neighborhood Relationship, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment according to whom the participants live, and this difference is in favor of the participants living with their family. Because the family is the smallest unit of the social structure where many social structures, such as adapting in solidarity with the changes in the outside world, maintaining life more effectively by creating rules together, marital satisfaction, love/being loved, are experienced at the purest and highest satisfaction level (Nazlı, 2014; Dil and Bulaktekin, 2011; Çalışkan *et al.*, 2017), this result is expected. At the same time, the fact that family solidarity facilitates the solution of many financial and spiritual problems, from childcare to household chores by providing social support (Hollar, 2003; Özmete, 2010; Aydın Boylu & Paçacıoğlu, 2016), meaningful and fulfilling family relationships affects positively and increases QoL.

The statistically significant difference in the Finding Home Sufficient factor with whom the participants live is in favor of the participants who live alone. This is

the expected result. The fact that all areas of the house belong to the person both positively affects the life of the individual and increases the QoL.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of the number of people living at home, the TQoL score does not show a statistically significant difference. However, in the Family Relationship and Neighborhood Relation sub-dimensions, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of those living at home with 5 or more persons.

There is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship and Neighborhood Relationship according to the number of individuals living at home, and the difference is in favor of the participants who live at home with 5 or more family members. While 2-4 people living in the house mostly indicate the elementary family structure, life of 5 or more people describes the family structure where families with 3 or more children and/or three generations live together. As the number of individuals living at home increases, Family Relationship and Neighborhood Relationship factors' scores increase. It is an expected situation because it is the core structure of family solidarity, social solidarity and social health (Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016). A meaningful and fulfilling family relationship positively affects the life of the individual and increases QoL.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of the number of rooms in the house where they live, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference in favor of individuals living in homes with 4 + 1 and larger rooms. In addition, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the variable of the number of rooms in the living house, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of individuals living in houses with 4+1 or more rooms. in the sub-dimensions of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Neighborhood Relation, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment and Well-Being,

There is a statistically significant difference in the factors of Family Relationship, Perceived Income Level, Neighborhood Relationship, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well Being, according to the number of rooms in the house where the participants live. This difference is in favor of individuals living in a house with 6 + 1 or more rooms. As the number of rooms in the house increases, the scores of Family Relationship, Perceived Income, Neighborhood Relationship, Finding Home Sufficient, Spiritual Life, Having Tools/Equipment, and Well Being. This is an expected and desired situation. Individuals living in a large house, having enough space for each individual in the house, living in a crowded family equipped with a social support network, strong intra-family communication, meaningful and fulfilling family relationships affect the life of the individual positively in many places and increase the QoL (Aydiner Boylu and Paçacıoğlu, 2016), These findings; coincides with the findings that individuals living with their families have higher QoL than lonely and their friends and that QoL increases as the number of individuals living in the same house increases.

When the TQoL score is compared with the variable of having a room specific to the individual in the living house, the TQoL score shows a statistically significant difference in favor of the individuals who own their own homes. In addition to this, when the sub-dimensions of QoL are compared with the variable of having a private room for

the individual in the living house, there is a statistically significant difference in favor of individuals who have a private room in the living house in the sub-dimensions of Perceived Income Level, Finding Home Sufficient and Having Tools/Equipment.

There is a statistically significant difference in the perceived income level, Finding Home Sufficient, and Having Tools/Equipment, according to the presence of a private room in the individual in the house where the participants live, and this difference is in favor of the individuals who have a private room belonging to the individual in the house where they live. This is expected. As the education level of the people, the awareness of living, the size of the house, the number of members in the family, the personal monthly income and the total monthly family income increase, the scores of the factors of Perceived Income Level, Finding Home Sufficient, and Having Tools/Equipment increase in favor of those who have a private room belonging to the individual in the living house. Same time, the emphasis on intimacy in the family due to the increase in the education level and the awareness of living, the increase in the room and usage area for the individuals as the size of the house increases, the number of individuals in the family to be suitable for the size of the house, the increase in the total income entering the house, the possibility of having a house, it increases the ownership of the tools/equipment necessary for the daily life of the people living at home or the budget allocated for this. When all of these come together, it overlaps with the other findings in this study and the existence of a private room belonging to the individual in the house where the participants live affects the QoL of the individuals positively.

## 6. Conclusion

As a result, the QLS of the individuals can be used as a total scale, in which the QoL levels of the individuals are handled in 17 sub-dimensions, and the QoL values of the participants can be measured by using each sub-dimension alone and/or some of them together. On the other hand, the fact that a person, who is a social being, has a low/high score in any living area, positively / negatively affects many other areas.

Sub-dimensions of QLS: gender, marital status, age, personal and family income, education, place of work, current employment status, with whom they live in the house, number of people living in the house, number of rooms in the house where they live, ownership status of the house where they live, having a room belonging to the individual in the house where they live, When compared according to the leasing status variables, the TQoL score or the QoL sub-factor scores of the majority of the participants change positively.

In this study, it can be said that men, married, young and over middle age, those with a high personal and/or total family monthly income, well-educated, current employees, self-employed, public employees, those who do not rent home, those who live in their own home, those who live together with their families, those who live in homes with one room per person, those who live in large families, those who live in houses with 2 + 1 or more rooms are happier and have higher TQoL score.

## 7. Recommendations

Women, who constitute half of the society and undertake more than one role at the same time, such as mothers, spouses, employees, housework, should be applied and supported positively in order to be more advantageous in terms of QoL.

In addition, all individuals should be informed about the quality of life at all other education levels starting from primary education and should be educated about a better quality of life.

It is not coincidental that the family relationship is the first factor affecting the QoL. All individuals should be educated in formal education processes, healthy family interaction, motherhood, fatherhood, and being a spouse.

In addition, benevolence and volunteering should be encouraged in educational processes and should be transformed into a conscious lifestyle. If the individual participates in volunteering, this situation should be transformed into a structure supported by institutional relations, and facilitative measures should be taken in the business environment.

The rigidity of the social structure should be constantly addressed in education programs so that individuals can more easily express and live their personal preferences, such as religion, lifestyle and sexual orientation.

Of course, living healthy is as much about having opportunities as well as creating opportunities and being healthy. In this context, individuals should be made aware of how to improve physical, psychological, and social health and why it should be improved from childhood. Awareness training should be given.

Of course, the neighborhood relationship requires the existence of a bilateral individual relationship. While the neighborhood of the new world is the basic first step of socialization and mutual solidarity, today, it is the first step to creating social solidarity and a safe environment. Training should be given on how and why neighborhood relationships based on minimum respect should be in formal education.

On the other hand, in order to increase personal income and total family income, perhaps a wage appropriate to the level of education should be made, and this wage (including this in the minimum wage) should be at a level that will provide a decent quality of life. Of course, this is not an element that individuals can overcome alone. This is a situation that the rulers and business owners of the country will solve.

Living in a safe environment is one of the most basic human and living rights. In this regard, cooperation between individuals living in that region, local administration and central authority should be created for both human and stray animals living in that area. Each party must do its part in a timely manner.

Of course, feeling safe is a multidimensional process. Trust is important in relationships, work environment, and family relationships and is at the third level in Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Although the expected trust in the business environment is mutually protected by laws, the flaws and deficiencies in implementation should be eliminated. The individual should primarily study at his/her favorite school, and be in his/her favorite job and profession. Individuals should earn wage income that will enable

them and their families to live a qualified life at a minimum level, and most importantly, working should be a structure which they will enjoy as a hobby rather than a job. Necessary legal and social support should be provided for this.

Individuals should be ensured to live in a house where they live, whether they are rented or their property, in a house where they will have their own living space, and all processes, including the financial situation of the family, should be reviewed, and legal standards should be set.

### **Conflict of Interest Statement**

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### **About the Author**

Prof. Dr. Faik Ardahan is a researcher at Akdeniz University, Sport Science Faculty, Recreation Department. His areas of expertise are outdoor recreation, social capital, life satisfaction, and quality of life.

ORCID [orcid.org/0000-0002-5319-2734](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5319-2734)

### **References**

- Aba, G. (2009). İş yaşam kalitesi ve motivasyon ilişkisi: Sağlık sektöründe bir uygulama (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya.
- Akgül Sarpkaya, O. (2012). Boşanmış Kadınlarda Kimlik Dönüşümü ve Toplumsal Baskıya Direnme Stratejileri: Van İli Örneği, Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyoloji Anabilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Van.
- Akgündüz, Y. (2013). Konaklama İşletmelerinde İş Doyumu, Yaşam Doyumu ve Öz Yeterlilik Arasındaki İlişkinin Analizi, *CBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(1), 180-204.
- Ardahan, F. (1998). Toplam Kalite Düşüncesi İle Zaman Yönetimi, *Önce Kalite Dergisi Kal-Der*(Kalite Derneği) Yayınları, Nisan-Mayıs 1998, Yıl:6, Sayı:25, İstanbul.
- Ardahan, F. (2004). Küçük Ve Orta Boy İşletmeciler İçin Zaman Yönetimi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Yayınevi, Antalya, 2004
- Ardahan, F. (2012). Life satisfaction and emotional intelligence of participants/nonparticipants in outdoor sports: Turkey case, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 62:4-11.
- Ardahan, F. (2013a). Bireyleri Rekreatif Spor Etkinliklerine Motive Eden Faktörlerin REMM Ölçeğini Kullanarak Çeşitli Demografik Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi: Antalya Örneği. *Pamukkale Journal of Sport Sciences*, 4(2): 1-15.
- Ardahan, F. (2013b). Komşuluk, Farklılığa Hoşgörü ve Yaşam Doyumu Arasındaki İlişki, İlişkinin Güçlendirilmesinde Rekreatif Etkinliklerin Önemi, *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(1): 1078-1090.

- Ardahan, F. (2014a). Bireylerin Sosyal Sermaye Profili: Antalya Örneği. *ASOS Journal, Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8): 38-56. [dx.doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.435](https://doi.org/10.16992/ASOS.435).
- Ardahan, F. (2014b). Sosyal Sermaye, Yaşam Doyumu ve Akademik Başarı İlişkisi: Akdeniz Üniversitesi, BESYO Örneği. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 11(1): 1212-1226.
- Ardahan, F. (2016). The Comparison of Life Satisfaction Level of Recreational Choir Singers and Non-Choir Singers. 4th International Academic Conference on Social Sciences. Proceedings book. July 28-29, 2016, Barcelona, Spain.
- Ardahan, F. (2018a). For Getting More Life Satisfaction Being A Choir Singer In Golden Years. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science* 4(5):1-17. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1239817.
- Ardahan, F. (2018b). Comparison of the Social Capital, Life Satisfaction, Achievement Perception and Emotional Intelligence Level of the Volunteers and Non-Volunteers. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science* 4(6):45-68. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1249064.
- Ardahan, F. (2020). Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi, Türk Popülasyonu İçin Geçerlilik Güvenirliliğinin Yapılması. 12th International Congress on Social Studies with Recent Researches Tam Metin Bildiriler Kitabı. 27 – 29 Mart 2020. Antalya, Türkiye.
- Ardahan, F., Turgut, T. and Kaplan Kalkan, A. (2016). Her Yönüyle Rekreasyon ( ing: All About Recreation) Editor: Faik Ardahan. Detay Yayıncılık (Detay Press). Ankara/Turkey.
- AREM, (2007). Birinci Avrupa Yaşam Kalitesi Anketi: Türkiye’de Yaşam Kalitesi, İçişleri Bakanlığı Araştırma ve Etütler Merkezi (AREM). Erişim tarihi: 21 Kasım 2014, [http://www.arem.gov.tr/ortak\\_icerik/arem/Raporlar/degerlendirme/Avrupa\\_yasam\\_kalitesi.pdf](http://www.arem.gov.tr/ortak_icerik/arem/Raporlar/degerlendirme/Avrupa_yasam_kalitesi.pdf)
- Aslan, D. (2009). Yaşlılık Döneminde Yaşam Kalitesi Kavramı: Kadın Sağlığı Bakışı, Yaşlanan Kadın Sempozyumu, Erişim tarihi: 21 Kasım 2014, [http://www.huzurevleri.org.tr/docs/Yaslilik\\_Doneminde\\_Yasam\\_Kalitesi\\_Kavrami.pdf](http://www.huzurevleri.org.tr/docs/Yaslilik_Doneminde_Yasam_Kalitesi_Kavrami.pdf)
- Avcı, K. ve Pala, K. (2004). Uludağ Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesinde Çalışan Araştırma Görevlisi ve Uzman Doktorların Yaşam Kalitesinin Değerlendirilmesi, *Uludağ Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30(2), 81-85.
- Ayaz, S., ve Beydağ, K. (2014). Hemşirelerin İş Yaşamı Kalitesini Etkileyen Etmenler: Balıkesir Örneği. *Sağlık ve Hemşirelik Yönetimi Dergisi*, 1(2), 61.
- Aydiner Boylu, A. (2007). Ailelerin Yaşam Kalitelerini Etkileyen Bazı Objektif ve Sübjektif Göstergelerin İncelenmesi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Aile ve Tüketici Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Doktora Tezi, Ankara.
- Aydiner Boylu, A. ve Paçacıoğlu, B. (2016). Yaşam Kalitesi Göstergeleri. *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi*. 8(15): 137-150.
- Azman, A. B., Sararaks, S., Rugayah, B., Low, L. L., Azian, A. A., Geeta, S. Ve Tiew, C. T. (2003). Quality of Life of the Malaysian General Population: Results from a Postal Survey Using the SF-36, *Medical Journal of Malaysia*, 58(5), 694-711.



- Bayat, M., (2005). How Family Members' Perceptions of Influences and Causes of Autism May Predict Assessment of Their Family Quality of Life. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Loyola University Chicago. IL.
- Baydur, H. (2001). Soma Elektrik Üretim ve Ticaret Anonim Şirketi Tesislerinde Çalışan İşçilerde Bazı Sosyodemografik Faktörlerle Yaşam Kalitesinin İlişkisi, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Manisa.
- Behlül, S. (2015). Sağlık Çalışanlarının İş Doyumunun Ve Yaşam Kalitesinin Değerlendirilmesi: İstanbul İli Örneği. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi: İstanbul Bilim Üniversitesi SBE.
- Bilir, N., Özcebe, H., Vazioğlu, S. A., Aslan, D., Subaşı, N. ve Telatar, T. G. (2005). "Van İlinde 15 Yaş Üzeri Erkeklerde SF-36 ile Yaşam Kalitesinin Değerlendirilmesi", *Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences*, 25: 663-668.
- Bjørnskov, C., Dreher, A., and Fischer, J. A. (2008). Cross-country determinants of life satisfaction: Exploring different determinants across groups in society. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(1):119-173.
- Boyer, R. ve Savageau, D. (1981). *Places Rated Almanac*. Rand Mc Nelly, Chicago.
- Campbell A., P. E. Converse and W. L. Rodgers; *The Quality of American Life – Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfactions*, 1976, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cılga, İ. (1994). *Gençlik ve Yaşam Niteliği*, Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Gençlik ve Spor Genel Müdürlüğü Basımevi.
- Çakmak, B. B. (2004). İş-Aile Yaşam Alanlarında Yaşanan Çatışmalar ve Bu Çatışmaların İşe Bağlılığa Etkisi. İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Çalışkan, M., Toker, M. ve Özbay, Y. (2017). Aile Yaşam Doyumu Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Uluslararası Erken Çocukluk Eğitimi Çalışmaları Dergisi* 2(1): 1-9.
- Demir, H. (2017). Anne Babası Ayrı Olan Ergenlerin Yaşam Kalitesinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi (Bağcılar İlçesi Örneği). Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul: İstanbul Nişantaşı Üniversitesi SBE.
- Demiral, Y. (2001). Çalışanlarda ve İşsizlerde Yaşam Kalitesine Etki Eden Etmenler ve Yaşam Kalitesi Düzeylerinin Karşılaştırılması, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı Doktora Tezi, İzmir.
- Demiray, G. (2019). Özel Gereksinimli Çocuğu Olan Ailelerde Yaşam Kalitesi, Umutsuzluk ve Yılmazlık Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi. Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışma Anabilim Dalı, Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Yüksek Lisans Programı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul.
- Demirkaya, Y. (2010). Çekmeköy'ün Sosyo-Ekonomik Yapısı ve Kentsel Yaşam Kalitesi, İstanbul: Çekmeköy Belediye Başkanlığı Yayını.
- Diener, E.D. (2000). Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and a Proposal for a National Index. *American Psychologist*. 55(1):34-43. DOI: 10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.34.

- Dil, S. Bulantekin, Ö. (2011). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinde Akademik Başarı Düzeyi ile Aile İşlevselliği ve Kontrol Odağı Arasındaki İlişkinin Belirlenmesi. *Psikiyatri Hemşirelik Dergisi*, 2(1), 17-24.
- Eriş, H. M. (2012). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Yaşam Kalitesi Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme Programı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara.
- Evans, D. R. (1994). Enhancing Quality of Life. *Social Indicators Research*. 33: 47-88.
- Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts. M. ve Whatmore, S. (2009). Quality of Life, Dictionary of Human Geography (5th). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gülmez, H. (2013). Çalışanların Yaşam Kalitesini Etkileyen Faktörler", *Turkish Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care*, 7(4), 74-82.
- Helliwell, J. F. (2003) How's life? Combining individual and national variables to explain subjective well-being. *Econ Modell* 20:331-336.
- Hollar, D. (2003). A Holistic Theoretical Model for Examining Welfare Reform: Quality of Life, *Public Administration Review*, 63(1), 90-99.
- Koçoğlu, D. ve Akın, B. (2009). Sosyoekonomik Eşitsizliklerin Sağlıklı Yaşam Biçimi Davranışları ve Yaşam Kalitesi ile İlişkisi, *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Elektronik Dergisi*, 2(4), 145-154.
- Liu, B.C. (1976). Quality of Life Indicators in US Metropolitan Areas:A Statistical Analysis., Praeger Publishers. New York.
- Lynda, L. ve Mandzuk, RN,BN. (2005). A concept analysis of quality of life. *Journal of Orthopaedic Nursing*. 9, 12-18.
- Memik, N. Ç., Ağaoğlu, B., Coşkun, A., Üneri, Ö. Ş. ve Karakaya I. (2007). Çocuklar için Yaşam Kalitesi Ölçeğinin 13-18 Yaş Ergen Formunun Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği, *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 18(4), 353-363.
- Nazlı, S. (2014). Aile Danışmanlığı. Ankara, Anı Yayıncılık.
- OECD, OECS Better Life Index (2015). <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/#/1111111111>. Okunma Tarihi: 14.09.2020.
- Oktik, N. (2004). Huzurevinde Yaşam ve Yaşam Kalitesi: Muğla Örneği. (1. Basım). Muğla: Muğla Üniversitesi Rektörlük Yayınları.
- Özar, Ş. ve Yakut Çakar, B. (2012). Aile, Devlet ve Piyasa Kıskaçında Boşanmış Kadınlar, *Kültür ve Siyasette Feminist Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 16, 1-12.
- Özgür, G., S. Yıldırım ve G. Ziyaretli. (2008). Hemşirelik Öğrencilerinin Yaşam Kalitesi Konusundaki Görüşleri Ve Yaşam Doyumları. *Ege Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksek Okulu*. 24.1, 57-65.
- Özmete, E. (2010). Aile Yaşam Kalitesi Dinamikleri: Aile İletişimi, Ebeveyn Sorumlulukları, Duygusal, Duygusal Refah, Fiziksel/Materyal Refahın Algılanması, *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 3(11), 455-465.
- Öztop, H., Şener, A., Güven, S. ve Doğan, N. (2009). Influences of Intergenerational Support on Life Satisfaction of the Elderly: The Turkish Sample, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(7): 957-970.

- Park, J., Hoffman, L., Marquis, J., Turnbull, A., Poston, D., Mannan, H., Wang, M., & Nelson, L. (2003) Assessing the family quality of life as the service outcome. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 47, 467-84.
- Perim, A. (2007). Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim, Araştırma ve Uygulama Hastanesi'nde Çalışan Hemşirelerin Kaliteli Yaşam Algısının Belirlenmesi, Trakya Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Trakya.
- Sabbah, I., Drouby, N., Sabbah, S., Retel-Rude, N. and Mercier, M. (2003). Quality of Life in Rural and Urban Populations in Lebanon Using SF-36 Health Survey, *Health Quality Life*, 1, 1-14.
- Sapancalı, F. (2009). Toplumsal Açından Yaşam Kalitesi. İzmir: Altın Nokta.
- Şeker, M. (2010). Mutluluk Ekonomisi, İktisat Fakültesi Sosyoloji Konferansları, 39. Seri, İstanbul: 15- 134.
- Şeker, M. (2015). Quality of Life Index: A Case Study of Istanbul. *Ekonometri ve İstatistik Sayı.23:1-15*
- The Quality of Life Research Unit, The Quality of Life Model. (2015). University of Toronto, [http://sites.utoronto.ca/qol/qol\\_model.htm](http://sites.utoronto.ca/qol/qol_model.htm)
- Top, M. Ş., Özden, S. Y. ve Sevim, M. E. (2003). Psikiyatride Yaşam Kalitesi, *Düşünen Adam*, 16(1), 18-23.
- Torlak, S. E. ve Yavuzçehre, P. S. (2008). Denizli Kent Yoksullarının Yaşam Kalitesi Üzerine Bir İnceleme, *Çağdaş Yerel Yönetimler*, 17 (2), 23-44.
- Tüzün, H.E. ve Eker, L. (2003). Sağlık değerlendirme ölçütleri ve yaşam kalitesi. *Sağlık ve Toplum*, 13, 3-7.
- Veenhoven, R. (1996). Developments in Satisfaction Research, *Social Indicators Research*, 37, 1-46.
- Veenhoven, R. (2000). The Four Qualities Of Life, Ordering Concepts and Measures of the Good Life. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 1: 1-39.
- WHO, (Whoqol Group). (1997). Measuring Quality of Life. Programme on Mental Health Division. The World Health Organization Quality of Life Instruments.
- Yancar, C. (2005). Madde Bağımlılarında İkinci Eksen Komorbidite ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Bağımlılık Şiddeti ve Yaşam Kalitesine Etkisinin Değerlendirilmesi, Sağlık Bakanlığı Bakırköy Prof. Dr. Mazhar Osman Ruh Sağlığı ve Sinir Hastalıkları Eğitim ve Araştırma Hastanesi Psikiyatri Birimi Uzmanlık Tezi, İstanbul.
- Yapıcı, A. (2006). Alkol Bağımlılığında Depresyon ve Anksiyetenin Yetiyitimi ve Yaşam Kalitesine Etkisi, Sağlık Bakanlığı Bakırköy Ruh Sağlığı ve Sinir Hastalıkları Hastanesi Uzmanlık Tezi, İstanbul.
- Yıldız, S. M. (2013). Spor ve Fiziksel Etkinlik İşletmelerinde İş Yaşam Kalitesinin Çalışanların İşten Ayrılma Niyetine Etkisi. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 13(3), 317-324.
- Yüksel, İ. (2004). Çalışma Yaşamı Kalitesinin Tipik ve Atipik İstihdam Açısından İncelenmesi. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 5(1): 47-58.
- Zenhner, R. (1977). Indicators of the Quality of Life in New Comm unities. M.A. Ballinger Publishing Co., Cambridge.

- Zorba, E. (2014). Yaşam Kalitesi ve Fiziksel Aktivite. 10Th. International Sports Sciences Congress, 82-85.
- TUİK (2020). Türkiye Nüfus İstatistikleri. Retrived in 12th May 2021 from <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Adrese-Dayali-Nufus-Kayit-Sistemi-Sonuc-lari-2020-37210>

Creative Commons licensing terms

Authors will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflict of interests, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated on the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).